

Appln. No. 09/937,569
Amdt. dated February 26, 2008
Reply to Office Action of October 1, 2007

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is in reply to the Office Action of October 1, 2007. A two (2) month Petition for Extension of Time is filed concurrently herewith. Therefore, the time period for reply extends up to and includes March 1, 2008. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for her careful review and consideration of the present application.

Claim Rejections Under USC § 103

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2 and 4-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,241,256 (Viret et al.) in view of Japanese Publication No. 1993210014A (Daimon et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 1 of the present application recites in part a display device including a matrix of spots each having a hollow transparent interior which allows passage of light therethrough and defines an internal edge for refracting light..." By contrast neither Viret et al. nor Daimon et al. disclose a matrix of spots each having a hollow transparent interior which allows passage of light therethrough and defines an internal edge for refracting light. The matrix of spots 22 shown in Figure 1 of Viret et al. are not transparent and are used to reflect light and not refract light. In column 3, lines 37 to 42, Viret et al. discloses diffusing areas 22 of predetermined size and shape that cause the light rays internally transmitted and internally reflected in the block 12 to be diffusely reflected through the upper surface of the light transmitting block 12 upon impinging on the area 22. The diffusing areas 22 are clearly light reflecting areas used to diffuse the internally reflected light. They do not allow the passage of light therethrough and they do not refract light as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Similarly, the spots shown in Figure 26a of Daimon et al. are not transparent and do not refract light. This can be clearly seen in Figure 26b of Daimon et al. which shows cross-hatched lines representing solid material surrounding the protruded spot 12 on three sides. Therefore, the

Appln. No. 09/937,569
Amdt. dated February 26, 2008
Reply to Office Action of October 1, 2007

protruded spots 12 of Daimon et al. do not allow the passage of light therethrough and do not refract light as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that Viret et al. does not disclose all the elements of claim 1 of the present application and that Daimon et al. does not remedy the deficiencies of Viret et al. It is submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Viret et al. and Daimon et al. Furthermore, since claims 2 and 4-20 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, it is submitted that these claims are also allowable over the combination of Viret et al. and Daimon et al.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection to claims 1, 4 and 20 is requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Dated: 26 February 2008

By Brian H. Batzli

Brian H. Batzli
Reg. No. 32,960

BHB/BR